



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/585,263

06/02/2000

Donald F. Gordon

SEDN/070CIP4

5643

56015

7590

03/07/2006

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP/
SEDNA PATENT SERVICES, LLC
595 SHREWSBURY AVENUE
SUITE 100
SHREWSBURY, NJ 07702

EXAMINER

SALTARELLI, DOMINIC D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2611

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/585,263

Applicant(s)

GORDON ET AL.

Examiner

Dominic D. Saltarelli

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 February 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5,7-10,13 and 14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5,7-10,13 and 14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on February 1, 2006 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed February 1, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C 112 first paragraph rejection of claims 1, 2, 13, and 14, the claims still include the limitation of "the bitmap for the broadcast video presentation", which is not supported in the originally filed specification, therefore applicant's amendments to claim 1 do not traverse the 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph rejection.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C 112 first paragraph rejection of claims 9 and 10, the examiner's best understanding of the amended limitation of "sending, from the terminal to the headend, a signal to activate the channel information window" (claim 9, lines 10-11) is supported in the specification on page 32, lines 9-16, which states "Alternatively, the bitmaps may be demandcast (sent by the server

Art Unit: 2611

in response to requests from the terminals),...”, which refers to, as best understood by the examiner, any signal sent from the client terminal which causes a desired bitmap to be downloaded from the server to the client terminal.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C 102(e) and 103(a) rejections of claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, and 14, applicant’s sole argument regards the claimed generation of bitmaps for the channel information windows, asserting that Ellis teaches generation said bitmaps at the client terminal and not the headend (applicant’s remarks, pages 7-8).

In response, as cited in each rejection of the disputed claims, Ellis clearly teaches that bitmaps for the channel information windows are a downloaded data type (col. 6, lines 28-44) “...the microcontroller 16 takes the program schedule information stored in the DRAM 18 and, in conjunction with other downloaded data types such as stored bit maps for the screen configuration and the graphic symbol or logo displays storing the non-volatile memory 20...” (*emphasis added*), wherein said downloaded data originates from the data provider which provides both the broadcast programming and the program schedule information (col. 4, lines 55-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the

Art Unit: 2611

art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1, 2, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 1, the limitations reciting “the bitmap for the broadcast video presentation” are not supported by the originally filed specification. There is no support for providing bitmaps for the broadcast video, as the broadcast video is defined as “broadcast TV, premium content, pay-per-view, and other content from a multiple service operation content delivery system” (applicant’s specification, page 27, lines 11-16).

Regarding claims 2, 13, and 14, these also depend on claim 1 and thus contain the same limitations, and are thus also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

Art Unit: 2611

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ellis et al. (5,986,650, of record) [Ellis].

Regarding claim 5, Ellis discloses a method comprising:

generating, at a headend, a plurality of bitmaps for each of a plurality of channel information windows (the downloaded bit maps, col. 6, lines 28-37, received from the data provider, col. 4, lines 55-67);

encoding, at the headend, a plurality of broadcast video displays and the channel information windows (the broadcast video and channel information are prepared for transmission by the data provider, which transmits the information to the receiver, col. 4 line 55 – col. 5 line 11), the broadcast video displays including a particular broadcast video display, each broadcast video display being programming from one of a plurality channels (the method takes place in a standard cable broadcast system, col. 4, lines 55-67), the channel information windows including information about the channels (shown in figs. 11A-13C);

transmitting, from the headend to the set top terminal, the broadcast video displays and the channel information windows (the broadcasts include program guide data, col. 4, lines 55- 67 which includes the bitmaps of the channel information windows shown in figs. 5A-5C and figs. 11A-13C, col. 6, lines 28-44);

compositing, at the set top terminal, the particular broadcast video display and an associated one of the channel information windows to produce a video stream for a display so that the channel information window overlays and

obscures a portion of the particular broadcast video display (as shown in figs. 5A-5C, col. 6, lines 45-61); and

changing, at the set top terminal, the channel information window in response to a navigation command in a mode, while the particular broadcast video display remains the same (BROWSE mode, col. 12, lines 20-43).

Regarding claim 8, Ellis discloses the method of claim 5, wherein the navigation command in that mode navigates only through favorite channels (col. 17, lines 7-20, wherein users browse through channel listings according to a preferred category).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 2, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis in view of Hoarty (5,485,197, of record).

Regarding claim 1, Ellis discloses a method comprising:

generating, at a headend, at least one bitmap for a channel information window (the downloaded and stored bit maps for screen configurations, col. 6, lines 28-37, part of input signal 11, col. 4, lines 55-67);

encoding, at the headend, a broadcast video presentation and the bitmap for the channel information window (the broadcast video and channel information are prepared for transmission by the data provider, which transmits the information to the receiver, col. 4 line 55 – col. 5 line 11), the broadcast video presentation being programming from one of a plurality of channels (the broadcast video is standard television programming);

transmitting, from the headend to a set top terminal, the broadcast video presentation and the bitmap for the channel information window (the broadcasts include program guide data, col. 4, lines 55-67 which includes the bitmaps of the channel information windows shown in figs. 5A-5C and figs. 11A-13C, col. 6, lines 28-44);

receiving at the set top terminal a signal to activate the channel information window (col. 9 line 62 – col. 10 line 11);

decoding, at the set top terminal, the broadcast video presentation and the bitmap for the channel information window (col. 5, lines 11-16, wherein the receiver extracts the video programming and the associated program guide data from the received channels); and

compositing, at the set top terminal, the bitmap for the channel information window and the broadcast video presentation to produce a video stream for a display so that the channel information window overlays and obscures a portion of the broadcast video presentation on the display (as shown in figs. 5A-5C, col. 6, lines 45-61).

Ellis fails to disclose bitmaps for the broadcast video presentation.

In an analogous art, Hoarty teaches generating video signals in digital format (Hoarty teaches MPEG-compressed digital data streams, col. 5, lines 15-45, from digital MMCs, col. 7, lines 36-65), wherein digital video streams are known to be more bandwidth efficient and less susceptible attenuation.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Ellis to include bitmaps (digital image data) for a broadcast video presentation, as taught by Hoarty, for the benefit of providing more bandwidth efficient and robust video signals to users.

Regarding claim 2, Ellis and Hoarty disclose the method of claim 1, wherein transmitting the bitmap for the channel information window is performed via an out of band channel (Ellis teaches the scheduling information is downloaded to the receiver using any known transmission means, including OOB channels, col. 5, lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 7, Ellis disclose the method of claim 5, including changing the particular broadcast video display to a new broadcast video display upon termination of the navigation command in that mode (by pressing "ENTER", and then the "MODE" key twice, col. 13, lines 1-18), but fails to disclose changing the particular broadcast video display is accomplished by generating, encoding, and transmitting video packet streams at the headend.

In an analogous art, Hoarty teaches a video distribution system (fig. 3) wherein changing a particular broadcast video display is accomplished by generating, encoding, and transmitting video packet streams at the headend (col. 7, lines 35-65, col. 8, lines 40-49, and col. 12, lines 15-32, wherein a particular user is allocated a particular frequency channel in order to access a very wide range of services, and a channel change command changes the content supplied on the "virtual" channel), for the benefit of providing a wide range of services to users.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Ellis to include said changing of the particular broadcast video display is accomplished by generating, encoding, and transmitting video packet streams at the headend, as taught by Hoarty, for the benefit of providing a wider range of services to users than would be possible given the finite amount of available bandwidth over a distribution medium.

9. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis in view of Bolanos et al. (5,793,364, of record) [Bolanos].

Regarding claims 9 and 10, Ellis discloses a method comprising:

generating, at a headend, a broadcast video presentation (the channels of video programming being provided to the receiver shown in fig. 1) and bitmaps for a channel information window (the downloaded and stored bit maps for screen configurations, col. 6, lines 28-37, part of input signal 11, col. 4, lines 55-

67), the broadcast video presentation being programming from one of a plurality of channels (the broadcast video is standard television programming);

encoding, at the headend, the broadcast video presentation and the bitmap for the channel information window (the broadcast video and channel information are prepared for transmission by the data provider, which transmits the information to the receiver, col. 4 line 55 – col. 5 line 11);

transmitting, from the headend to a set top terminal, the broadcast video presentation and the bitmap for the channel information window (the broadcasts include program guide data, col. 4, lines 55-67 which includes the bitmaps of the channel information windows shown in figs. 5A-5C and figs. 11A-13C, col. 6, lines 28-44);

decoding, at the set top terminal, the broadcast video presentation and the bitmap for the channel information window (col. 5, lines 11-16, wherein the receiver extracts the video programming and the associated program guide data from the received channels); and

compositing, at the terminal, the bitmap for the channel information window and the broadcast video presentation to produce a video stream for a display so that the channel information window overlays and obscures a portion of the broadcast video presentation in the video stream (as shown in figs. 5A-5C, col. 6, lines 45-61).

Ellis fails to disclose receiving at the headend from the terminal, a signal to active the channel information window.

In an analogous art, Bolanos teaches downloading graphics for a user interface on demand (col. 3, lines 24-32), for the benefit of not having to repeatedly transmit the user interface graphics.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Ellis to include downloading graphics for the user interface on demand [in response to an activation signal], as taught by Bolanos, for the benefit of not having to repeatedly transmit the channel information window bitmap.

10. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis and Hoarty as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bolanos.

Regarding claim 13, Ellis and Hoarty disclose the method of claim 1, but fails to disclose requesting, by the set top terminal from the headend, the bitmap for the channel information in response to the signal to activate the channel information window.

In an analogous art, Bolanos teaches downloading graphics for a user interface on demand (col. 3, lines 24-32), for the benefit of not having to repeatedly transmit the user interface graphics.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Ellis and Hoarty to include downloading graphics for the user interface on demand, as taught by Bolanos, for the benefit of not having to repeatedly transmit the channel information window bitmap.

11. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis and Hoarty as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of MacInnis (5,951,639, of record).

Regarding claim 14, Ellis and Hoarty disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the set top terminal causes the channel information window to overlay the broadcast video presentation in response to the signal to activate the channel activation window (Ellis, col. 9, lines 1-18) but fails to disclose the bitmap for the channel information window is broadcast continually.

In an analogous art, MacInnis teaches a method for downloading data wherein the data is broadcast continually (col. 4, lines 20-41), for the benefit of alleviating the need to request the data from a source (col. 4, lines 38-41).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Ellis and Hoarty to include broadcasting the data continually, as taught by MacInnis, for the benefit of alleviating the need to request the channel information window from the headend.

Conclusion

12. The following are suggested formats for either a Certificate of Mailing or Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). The certification may be included with all correspondence concerning this application or proceeding to establish a date of mailing or transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). Proper use of this procedure will result in such communication being considered as timely if the established date is within the required period for reply. The Certificate should be signed by the individual actually depositing or transmitting the correspondence or by an individual who, upon information and belief, expects the correspondence to be mailed or transmitted in the normal course of business by another no later than the date indicated.

Art Unit: 2611

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on _____
(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Signature: _____

Registration Number: _____

Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (703) _____ - _____ on _____
(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Signature: _____

Registration Number: _____

Please refer to 37 CFR 1.6(d) and 1.8(a)(2) for filing limitations concerning facsimile transmissions and mailing, respectively.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dominic D. Saltarelli whose telephone number is (571) 272-7302. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:00am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dominic Saltarelli
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2611

DS



JOHN MILLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600